UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,785	04/30/2001	Karen P. Parnell	OIC0044US	4346

60975   7590   07/31/2008
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER
SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1.   This office action is in response to applicant's arguments filed

7/14/08. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 38-43, 45 and 46-53 are

currently pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/08 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

        More specifically, applicant argues, regarding claim 1, "In contrast,

Applicant's claim 1 includes modifying the base version of the application.

The plain language of the claim clearly states that this modifying is

performed "in response to at least one of the internationalization or the

localization of the base version of the application."

        This limitation, in some implementations of the invention, may provide

value that is not available to a practitioner of the Malcolm technology, at

least because the Malcolm translators do not provide information back to

Malcolm's code developers." However, the Examiner cannot concur with

applicant's position. It is obvious, in the cited sections, Malcolm, C.10 lines

16-68, teaches a "development cycle", a loop, including the developing of

the base version of an application, and in modifying the base version of the

application in response to at least one of the internationalization or the

localization of the base version of the application. Malcolm explicitly states,

in a cited portion of the above:

A solution to this problem is shown in Fig. 4, during the development

process of creating the initial panels and language specific file associated

therewith. A previous version of a language depend file 136, which would

be a file earlier sent to a translation center, for example, is compared with

the current version of the language depend file 70. A change log file 140 is

generated as a result.

Therefore, it is obvious, that in developing the initial panels in the

base version of the application, there is previous version of a translated file

that was sent to the translators, which is interpreted as a cyclic build,

between the initial panel (base version) and the internationalization or

localization. It is evident that the previously internationalized/localized

version has been returned to the base version developers, see C.11 lines

25-33, wherein the new code is continued in development/modification in

response to the returned version, and subsequent files are also returned to

the translation centers, thus, fulfilling every requirement by applicant's

claims, enabling a cyclic development cycle.

3.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references

individually, more specifically applicant's arguments regarding claim 45,

one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually

where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re*

Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800

F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

It appears applicant argues, "The Final Office Action appears to

equate Malcolm's "builds" with Applicant's internationalization. Even if this

characterization is correct (a point which Applicant does not concede), the

cited passages at most teach (1) that different internationalizations can be

performed concurrently, and (2) that various activities can be done in

parallel."

The Examiner notes, the rejection is based on Lee Rojas, and

Malcolm. Applicant mentions Lee and Malcolm, however does not discuss

the rejection as a whole, in terms of each cited reference as they depend

on each other to teach applicant's claimed invention. It is apparent that, as

a combination, it is taught, wherein Lee, Rojas and Malcolm make obvious

claim 1 (see previous rejection of claim 1). Lee further teaches, wherein the localization of the base version of the application comprises a localization concurrently with an internationalization (C.3 lines 59-61), but lacks the first stage and second stage (stages). However, Malcolm teaches stages (see claim 1, internationalization, localization and concurrent discussion regarding stages). Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Lee's internationalization and Rojas' pseudo-localization with the concurrent (parallel) localization and internationalization in stages, for the benefit of reducing overall time requirements for development (Malcolm, C.10.1ines 25-27). Therefore, one ordinarily skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, would have the knowledge, and capability to have stages of development, the ability to localize a first stage, concurrently with an internationalization of a second stage, wherein it has been explicitly stated, by the combination above, concurrent and parallel builds on stages of a base version of an application, including internationalization, and localization, provides a reduction in overall time requirements for development.

Applicant's arguments depending on claims 1, and 45, regarding their dependent claims are also unpersuasive.

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAMONT M. SPOONER whose telephone number is (571)272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

lms
7/28/08
/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626